

CANDOUR

*The British
Views - Letter*

To defend national sovereignty against the menace of international finance

Vol XLIII No 2

Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper

February 1991

The A.B.C. of Politics

FAITH AND FREEDOM

ROSINE de BOUNEVIALLE explains why we need to regain our true faith

THERE is what Helen Waddell calls "the innocent story" quoted in her book on *The Wandering Scholars* of mediaeval Europe: "Three clerks went on pilgrimage to sea without provision, that being God's business, only that the youngest said, 'I think I will take the little cat.'" She tells how they came to an island and halted there to recite the Psalms for the day and the little cat went down and fished for them a great salmon; how they doubted, not seeing the hand of the Lord in the paw of the little cat, until they roused again from their devotions to see the salmon brandering on the fire of coals, which brought them too near the shore of Lake Tiberias to doubt.

As a society we are too far from faith in God Himself to believe in His miracles. It is as if we left the feast thinking there was no more wine to be had there, and went and gorged ourselves on the raw "Spirit of the Modern Age" instead. Addiction to that spirit has done for the body politic what alcoholic rot-gut does to the drunkard.

Man's Hubristic Contempt

God does not do for us anything that, with His grace, we can very well do for ourselves. As someone has pointed out, at Cana Our Lord did not rub a lamp and summon a genie to appear. His mother said to the servants, "Do whatever He tells you," so they drew the water, filled the pots and carried them to the steward. How would the three clerks have fared if the youngest had not taken the little cat to do the fishing? But we are above all that! We think it is "childish things" we have put away but, as so often, our interpretation of a biblical phrase is at fault. We have put away the child's innocence and wonder, whilst clinging to the legacy of Adam's sin that festers like a cancer we obstinately refuse to have removed. So long as we refuse the baptism that will fill our souls with grace, so long shall we be denied the wisdom to avert threatened destruction by obeying the laws of God instead of legalising the lusts of Man.

The so-called "Greens" are the latest fashion in panacea production. We are commanded to press for political decisions resulting in Government action to ban the evils that have polluted Mother Earth and brought about the "hole in the ozone" causing "global warming." The "evils" to be banned at any cost are nuclear bombs and nuclear reactors, refrigerators, weedkillers, waste, sewage and scent sprayers. Above all, "ban babies" runs the recipe for global salvation. Only thus shall we make space and time to save the elephants, whales, tigers, barn owls and bats, together with everything else from wind flowers to wild orchids. In the resulting ideal One World, we shall

have "saved" everything except "the little ones" and our own souls when the sum of all our sins again finds us out.

It is the global warning we should be heeding lest our abandoned race should again be reduced to a second Noah and seven companions - though this time we cannot be sure of even eight survivors since disgraceful Man has earned himself Babel and Babylon, Sodom and Gomorrah, and the destruction of both Jerusalem and the ancient Covenant between God and His chosen people. Over the centuries Man's sins have brought the wages of wars, plagues, pestilences, earthquakes and eruptions - everything except the once-and-for-all Deluge - and God's answer to that could be Drought!

Faith in Man has made us slaves; faith in God will make us free. If we still will not live free by faith in Jesus Christ, true God and true Man, and in the light of the Church He founded, we shall inevitably be enslaved in the One World envisaged by the perpetrators of the present chaos, which can only be the forerunner of Satan's hellish kingdom. If we will only return to the feast even when there appears to be no wine, we shall be there when the miracle happens. Nineveh repented; Nineveh was spared. Even Jonah was surprised!

HOLY MOTHER EARTH

A postscript from DON BELL on the New Age religion of Environmentalism

LAST year the Greenies, Communists, Environmental Extremists, New Agers and One World Enthusiasts decided that 1990 was "Environmental Crisis" Year. **Time** magazine named Earth "the Planet of the Year," replacing its traditional "Man of the Year" (who had been Gorbachev the previous year!). Said **Time's** editors, "Now, more than ever, the world needs leaders who can inspire their fellow citizens with a fiery sense of mission, not a nationalistic or military campaign but a universal crusade to save the planet."

Crisis creation is a speciality with the One Worlders. And now the Insiders are working overtime to establish three permanent crises: the Greenhouse Effect, Toxic Pollution and the Ozone Hole. Whether these are true or false isn't the point. The media can present them as permanent crises, and the people will believe that these three are a threat to the "global village" and can be remedied only by "global co-operation." Therefore, a "global authority" with power to overrule national governments must be established. How very convenient that these three "crises" have come along at a time when the One Worlders are at the very brink of the culmination of their plans. The people will believe and accent their schemes "in our own best interests."

It is significant that the leaders in this environmental crusade refer to it as a religion. The **Guardian Weekly** said, "A new ideology is waiting in the wings to provide both a common system of thought and, in a sense, a common enemy. Call it environmentalism, greenism, planetism. It has been growing for years, but in the last few months it has begun to acquire the status of an official world religion." If Environmentalism has become a world religion, if the World Spirit envisaged by Hegel has replaced the Holy Spirit and State (which, to Hegel, was all) is to be worshipped as God, then "take heed of yourselves, that your heart be not deceived, and ye turn aside and serve other gods and worship them."

ONE TRUTH THAT'S NOT A CASUALTY

FRANK BROOKES spots the reality behind the myth of U.N. morality

ONE truth that has not become a casualty of the war in the Gulf is the truth that the United Nations is not really a highly moral body, wisely and justly presiding over the political affairs of nations. Rather, it is a vast rubber stamp whose appearance upon a declaration of war gives immense seeming authority to those waging it.

In his 'Hurrah for America' stance taken in his **Sunday Telegraph** leader of 20th January, Peregrine Worsthorpe admits this. For this political honesty, however belated it may be, Worsthorpe is to be congratulated.

But after all Nationalists, and indeed anyone with eyes to see and a working brain, have known that this must always have been inevitable since the U.N. came into existence! Yet when we have put forward this view, we have been ignored or looked upon with hostility. We were told the U.N. involved the world coming together and acting in the real interests of peace and justice, despite the existence of some puzzling features.

Flawed Logic

Aggression was wrong and would not be tolerated, according to the moralists of the U.N. Yet somehow or other it was tolerated. There was the Israeli aggression against Palestine that started over forty years ago. There was Russian brutality against Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Afghanistan and, more recently, the Baltic States. Even America invaded Panama with impunity.

The mistake Saddam Hussein made was in misreading this inconsistent logic and thinking he could invade Kuwait without repercussion. He should have realised that you really cannot use logic with the manipulators of the "new world order."

So we had George Bush in the role of peace-maker building up the biggest gathering of military might ever seen. Piously and almost with tears in his

eyes, he begged Saddam to avoid the horrors of war - a war which Bush, not Saddam, was preparing to unleash. We had the sight of the British poodles, Thatcher and Major (and, of course, Kinnock and most of the other inhabitants of the Westminster Dogs' Home) unctuously baying their condemnation of Saddam and whining at the prospect of the anguish and bloodshed that lay ahead.

They were going to start it, of course, but somehow or other they had to get out of being blamed for it. So what to do? Easy! Get the United Nations to rubber stamp action against Saddam.

Bob's Your U.N.cle!

In his adulatory leader, Worsthorpe congratulated American skill in manipulating the U.N. Many people think "U.N. war good; U.S. war bad," he wrote. So, it was "plainly right to get U.N. backing for American intervention wherever possible, or if not right, at any rate prudent." This was achieved largely because of Bush's diplomatic genius, thought Worsthorpe, adding that with or without U.N. backing the Americans and the British would have gone to war.

So one truth that has not yet been fatally injured is that whatever the real reason behind Anglo-American attacks on Iraq, it is not to enable the nations of the world to act with one moral conscience.

"So much rubbish has been written about U.N. backing being the essential legitimising factor," Worsthorpe wrote, adding that he was all for it so long as people didn't take it seriously. The trouble is, people do. So journals like **Candour** seemingly still have much work ahead opening people's minds to what really lies behind events dominating the world's stage.

Although we don't really see eye to eye, Mr Worsthorpe, thank you for wittingly or unwittingly exposing the true value of the United Nations.

C U T A N D T H R U S T

JANUS offers candid comment on news from home and abroad

WE heard on Radio Four a week or two ago a business man talking about trading with Eastern Europe. He said that if his opposite numbers had not sufficient hard currency to buy his goods, he would be quite willing to accept an appropriate amount of steel or whatever else he could sell at a profit, and so deal by barter. We recall that in the 1930s Germany had a firmly held belief that if goods were available for exchange between nations, there was no need for either party to resort to international lending houses to finance the deal. Considering how this policy incurred the unrelenting hostility of the New York Money Power, if Western business men begin talking of barter too loudly, we shall be in the next world war before anyone can shout "Sanctions"!

* * * *

PLANS to set up a private security company employing Gurkhas (all with a minimum of twelve years Army service) have been blocked. The Gurkhas have been refused work permits because they are not regarded as having special skills. Surely they would have made excellent security guards, but apparently not in the eyes of the authorities. Perhaps it is thought that loyalty, bravery and training are undesirable characteristics. The Gurkhas' best plan would be to enter the country illegally and claim to be refugees; then there would be little difficulty in finding them employment, especially as security guards. They would know all the loop-holes - or would that be too practical?

* * * *

ALL but two of the 46 ships hired by the Ministry of Defence to carry men and munitions to the Gulf are under foreign flags, but some have British officers. Naval divers cannot check for underwater limpet mines because the ships are part of a civilian force under peacetime charter; however, private divers must not be used because the ships are carrying military equipment! No doubt the great brains responsible for this nonsense will eventually retire loaded with honours for service to the country. Meanwhile, the European Community committee of the House of Lords has rejected a proposal to replace the Red Ensign with the Common Market rag. Although their Lordships have acted properly, the question is of increasingly academic importance since present trends will result in us having no Merchant Navy at all!

* * * *

HILAIRE Belloc wrote a book, foreshadowing the Welfare State, entitled **The Servile State**. Assuming that it must be anti-semitic because he also wrote a book called **The Jews** (which is really quite pro-semitic), the ruling group on one city council want to have the book removed from the shelves of its libraries. Belloc wrote many other books during his fruitful literary life, one of which was called **The Great Heresies**. This sought to show Mohammedanism was actually a Christian heresy, deriving its main beliefs from the Catholic Church. Belloc has been dead for a number of years; perhaps this is just as well or else we might find two normally combative religious groups combining in common hatred of him, making the Rushdie rumpus sound like a garden party!

THE birth rate in Western Europe is so low that the population could enter absolute decline; France, Italy, Spain and Portugal are experiencing "difficulties" because of the largely illegal migration from North Africa; we are not entirely free from uninvited visitors ourselves; there is now fear of a massive wave of Russian immigrants, understandably wanting to flee the remorseless tyranny strangling their own land. All this poses a very serious threat to the very existence, not only of this country, but all of civilised Europe. Yet is there any publicity campaign to bring the threat home to the ordinary person in the street? Not at all. Far more concern is shown over the possible extermination of any number of animals, from whales down to insects. Not a word is uttered about the conservation of our own people. And all the while the abortion abattoirs daily deal out death to hundreds of British babies. In any other age, this would have been thought madness.

* * * *

A STATUE of Lord Nelson has been banned from a park in Birmingham after one Labour councillor condemned the Admiral as a "one-eyed, one-armed warmonger." We expected such denigratory criticism of the disabled to meet with a furious response, but apparently it didn't. It seems to us that the fellow is a prig whose backside, as A.K. Chesterton used to put it, "has too long gone unkicked." Would he have had the courage to utter his cheap insult to Nelson's face had he still been alive?

* * * *

A MASS grave, containing more than 450 skeletons thought to be the remains of British and Allied servicemen, has been uncovered in Thailand near a notorious Japanese P.O.W. camp. Bones, including complete skeletons, are to undergo tests at an American identification laboratory in Hawaii to ascertain how these poor, unfortunate souls died. Officials in Thailand, meanwhile, are considering turning the site into a tourist attraction. When we recall the unceasing screeches of hatred that greeted the proposal to site a Carmelite Sisters convent close to Auschwitz (vide **Candour**, December 1989), the screams of silence that have followed this Thai insult to our war dead are shameful.

* * * *

THERE is a play on in London based on **The Wind in the Willows**. In the programme, apparently, there is a quotation from Jonathan Miller who refers to Kenneth Graham's tale as "an old Thames-side story of country house fascism." Can any reader make sense of this nonsense? Who are the "fascists"? Toad? Badger? The Weasels? In any case, fascism did not exist until some years after the book was originally published, so they cannot have been more than "proto-fascists"! Or was Graham a prophet?

THE PARTY SYSTEM AND THE CORRUPTION OF PARLIAMENT

by the late BEN GREENE

A trenchant analysis of the revolution that has enabled the modern system of party politics to render meaningless our age-old principles of English law and government. Only £1, including U.K. postage, from Candour Publishing Company, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants GU33 7DD.

CHESTERTON AND MOSLEY

JOHN TYNDALL vindicates A.K. Chesterton's political career

JEFFREY HAMM, in his article in the last issue of *Candour* dealing with Sir Oswald Mosley and A.K. Chesterton, opens with a comment on AKC in which he speaks of the "inconsistencies in the logical processes of his first-class mind." If anyone is to be accused of inconsistency, I would submit that it should be not A.K. Chesterton but Sir Oswald Mosley. Chesterton, in his post-war activities and writings, remained true to the principles he had stood for and served in the pre-war period: he remained a British Nationalist, a believer in the necessity for British freedom and sovereignty and a firm advocate of the view that Britain's destiny lay with the global community of her overseas kin. Only in his tactical approach did he undergo any change, and this was understandable in view of the impact that the war, and its accompanying propaganda, had had on the public's perception of fascism.

Mosley, by contrast, underwent in his post-war metamorphosis a total change, not only in his tactical appraisal, but in the way of a root-and-branch switch of ideology and allegiance, transforming himself from a nationalist into an internationalist, from an upholder of British freedom and sovereignty into an advocate of the surrender of British sovereignty to a government of Europe.

Jeffrey Hamm will of course argue that these changes were simply realistic adaptations to changing circumstances, but here I would not accept his reasoning. In fact, if he cannot do better than his recent *Candour* article in this regard he can have little case to answer.

He asks: why did AKC, after having written a fulsome tribute to Mosley in *Portrait of a Leader*, not follow his leader, firstly into internment under Regulation 18b, and then into the post-war Union Movement? If Mr. Hamm does not understand why, I doubt if anything I say could persuade him. A.K. Chesterton could not follow Mosley in either of these directions for the simple reason that he thought him wrong in both cases. That he had previously written a highly complimentary biography of Mosley did not, and could not, bind him to supporting the latter subsequently in his every utterance and action.

On the question of the war, 18b and internment, there have always been two views, and I have always respected both of them. It was never easy for intelligent and patriotic men to decide whether they should join the forces of their country and fight for it in a war that was unjust, wrong and against the national interest or to oppose that war and risk imprisonment in so doing. To a great extent, this issue was decided for each individual by factors outside his or her own power. No-one 'volunteered' to be interned; everyone who suffered internment did so because it was imposed upon them. By the time 18b was enforced, AKC had become politically separated from Mosley and, for reasons best known to officialdom, not on the internment list. Should he, in these circumstances, have said: "What about me? You must lock me up too -- because I too dislike the war!"

AK's subsequent decision to enlist in Britain's armed forces may have been the correct one or may not have been -- as I have said, there are two views on that subject. I would, however, quote Sir Oswald Mosley himself, who said at the outset of the war that, although he and his movement had opposed that war with all their strength, now that the matter had been resolved and Britain was committed to fight it, no member of British Union should do anything to harm their country. AKC evidently interpreted this principle to mean that every able-bodied man should do his bit towards defending Britain and seeing to it that she should not suffer defeat and invasion. Whether, from the strictly political point of view, this was the most prudent policy, no-one can deny that it was entirely a patriotic and honourable one.

As to the suggestion, made by Mr. Hamm, that AKC took the view that "Hitler's Germany constituted a threat to the British Empire," that is quite ludicrous, as a perusal of everything that Chesterton has written on the subject will easily bear out.

European Union Or Empire Loyalty?

As to why Chesterton did not follow Mosley into Union Movement in the post-war period, the simple answer is that Chesterton recognised the programme adopted by Mosley in that movement as being a turning upside down, if not actually a betrayal, of some of the most fundamental values for which British Union had fought. So, incidentally, did thousands of others. That is why Union Movement never succeeded in attracting a fraction of the support that the BU had done previously. It was the reason why I, as a youngster entering the political fray in the late 1950s, would not entertain the idea of supporting Mosley for one second, despite my admiration for so much of what he had said and done in the 1930s.

Mr. Hamm then speaks of "old friends of Chesterton" who "felt he was indulging in nostalgia when he founded the League of Empire Loyalists and wondered how one could be loyal to an Empire which (sadly) no longer existed." The truth is that when the LEL was founded the British Empire did indeed still exist, although it had become clear that all current policies were leading to its dismantlement. AKC was right to try to mobilise public opinion against those policies just for as long as there was a possibility, however slim, that this could be achieved. Once the point had been reached at which the dismantlement of the old Empire had proceeded beyond recall, it remained right to try to salvage what had been valuable in this Empire for the purpose of building a new structure to replace it. This was what AKC pursued as leader of the National Front in its early years of 1967-70. It remains the right policy today, although now the terminology of 'Empire' is no longer appropriate, as AKC, had he been alive now, would have been the first to acknowledge.

But let us look again at Mr. Hamm's assertion that, once the Empire had been wrecked by the betrayers who ruled us in the post-war years, no effort should be made to retrieve it -- any of it. Just where does that reasoning take us? If we accepted it as logical, we would feel justified in doing nothing to reverse any of the appalling policies that have been adopted to the detriment of this country in the past half-century. We would say that, now Britain has been made a multi-racial society, we must accept this because we cannot change it. We would say that, now large parts of British manufacturing industry have been destroyed, we should take that as a *fait accompli* and attempt to do nothing to reverse the process.

When bad policies have been adopted which have led to a particularly bad situation, the sensible and spirited thing to do is reverse those policies and change that situation. Mr. Hamm's prescription, on the other hand, seems to be that whatever is done in politics is done and must be accepted as permanent. Where the hell would we be if everyone in history had acted according to that rule?

Mr. Hamm cites in support of his argument that, as Australia, for instance, has become to some extent industrialised, the old basis for trade with Britain -- that of a straight swap of our manufactured goods for its food and minerals -- no longer exists. Well of course this new circumstance does to some extent change the nature of Anglo-Australian trade, but that does not mean that Britain and Australia do not continue to have economies that are much more naturally complementary than those of Europe. Australia continues, and will continue, to have a large food surplus and an even larger one in minerals. It would be insanity for Australia not to exploit these assets by maintaining a large export trade in such commodities, and this would mean importing manufactured products as the only practical basis on which to enable her customers to pay for what she exported to them. This means that there continues to be a basis for a very large degree of trade between Australia and Britain. In fact the arguments that Mr. Hamm uses to refute that idea might be used with tripled emphasis to refute the view that there is a basis for a greater trade between Britain and Europe, for the economies of our main trading partners in Europe are far less complementary, and far more competitive, to ours. They, much more than Australia, make themselves the goods which we wish to sell to them. That is why Europe simply is not working.

The same answer may be given to Mr. Hamm's argument about the non-British elements in the population of Australia and the other old 'Dominions'. Of course, these elements make it less easy than it would otherwise be for us to maintain the old family ties with those countries. But how much more forcibly might this very same argument be used against the theory that we can build permanent and binding ties with the nations of the Continent of Europe? If the populations of the old 'Dominions' are not wholly British, they nevertheless remain largely so. On the other hand, the populations of the countries of mainland Europe are almost wholly non-British. Need I say any more?

The present world is witnessing the inexorable decline and collapse of internationalism. We have seen it in the Soviet Union. We have seen it in the rest of Eastern Europe. We are seeing it now in its incipient form in Western Europe, whose inter-governmental councils are racked by quarrels over farm-subsidies, import-and-export quotas, currency regulations, banking structures and wildly contrasting views about the future shape of political relationships. We can achieve far better relations with Europe -- and this is something that I am at one with Mr. Hamm in wanting to see -- by our mutually acknowledging that our interests are to a large extent different, our needs diverse and our destinies separate. A.K. Chesterton was one of those who always recognised this; Sir Oswald Mosley, in the post-war phase of his political career, refused to do so. The tide of events is now vindicating, not Mosley, but Chesterton. That is the simple truth.

UNDER TWO FLAGS

RAISE high the Double Standard on Westminster spire
And furl the Jack which honour sired.

Laud lickspittlers who debate a way to war,
Despair for Mother Parliament bespoke to role of whore.
Appease for forty-years the rape of Palestine,
Give instant condemnation when Iraq steps out of line.
Allies to dishonour, hypocrisy, deceit -
The trick is "fait accompli" and involvement 'comes complete.
Shades of the Community, not quite "united" now
To deal in death so eagerly in a non-members row.
But chairborne braves in Parliament, Congress and Senate
Deem it their bounden duty for their Sons to free Kuwait.

And war not made for Empire, defence of Motherland,
The battle's inspiration is a far-off patch of sand.

B.E. BIGGS

Read LETTER TO SADDAM HUSSEIN by COLIN JORDAN. Copies 10p each
plus postage from Gothic Ripples, Thorgarth, Greenhow Hill,
Harrogate, North Yorkshire HG3 5JQ.

AVAILABLE FROM CANDOUR TAPES

David Irving In Australia (C90) £5 N.F. In Action 1977 (C60) £4
Hidden Aspects Of Katyn Massacre Louis Fitzgibbon (C90) £5
A.K. Chesterton Speaks (60) £4 Mosley Speaks To You (C90) £5
Father Charles Coughlin On The Air April 1937 (C60) £4
The Mass At Downham Market (C60) £4 Praying The Rosary (C90) £5

Please address orders to CANDOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT.

WHERE HAVE ALL THE LITTLE GIRLS GONE?

Sr CLARE PECKHAM R.S.C.J. sees a grim future awaiting our world

JOHN Cotter's new pamphlet * comes at an opportune moment in time. A time when abortion, both legally and illegally, is a world-wide phenomenon, and is becoming more and more accessible at any time during pregnancy, even for minors, and without parental consent; a time when abortion is encouraged and funded by governments and pro-abortionists; a time when abortion is possible simply by taking a pill - RU-486.

Many God-fearing people have expended much of their time, energy and money fighting the evil of abortion, seeking the enactment of just laws to protect the unborn and risking bodily harm and imprisonment in their efforts to close abortion clinics. Are these good and zealous people aware of the vast discrimination against baby girls in this whole abortion issue? Are they, and are the abortionists themselves, aware of the catastrophic implications of this widespread discrimination? Mr Cotter succinctly brings to our attention the horrifying statistics concerning abortion, and its devastating consequences for society.

Are nations and races annihilating themselves through their merciless murder of millions of unborn babies? Are girls becoming second-class citizens, as more and more parents prefer boys and abort their unwanted girls? In China, in Russia, in Europe, the same terrible trend: we want boys, not girls. With the continuing advancement of medical technology and its possibility now of producing the desired sex, will this preference for boys now mean that girls soon become a minority?

Mr Cotter quotes a Soviet geneticist as saying back in 1974: "What we would have in the next generation, then, would be about 90 per cent boys and 10 per cent girls." Could such a devastating imbalance be a reality by the year 2000? Is the feminist battle cry, "A Right To Choose," turning against women, destroying them and the women of the future? Have the doctors and the medical profession in general, supposedly dedicated to the betterment and preservation of human lives, become so corrupt and so perverted that destroying life for a price is now "big business"? These are some of the many serious questions answered in this booklet.

The author's extensive research on this terrible topic, his wide knowledge of the facts concerning abortion, and his zealous concern, both for the defence of the unborn and for the future of the human race, make Mr Cotter's pamphlet essential reading.

* **Where Have All The Little Girls Gone?** John Cotter. Available from Angelus Books, 38 Jill's Court, Barrie, Ontario, Canada L4M 4L7. Price \$3 plus postage to readers in Canada and U.S.A.; £3 to U.K. readers.

Read **SPEARHEAD** - Edited by John Tyndall and published in support of the B.N.P. Sample copy 87p from P.O. Box 117, Welling, Kent DA16 3DW.

CANDOUR SUBSCRIPTION RATES

U.K. £8.00 OVERSEAS £10 U.S. \$20 AIRMAIL PER ANNUM

Printed and published by Candour Publishing Company, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire GU33 7DD, England. [Editor: Rosine de Bouneville]